



Other people
make mistakes
Slow down

From: Mark O'Donnell
Sent: Monday, 9 June 2014 1:56 p.m.
To: Michael Cummins; Mark Kinvig; Keith McGuire; Maurice Smith; Eileen Kerry; C Foley
Cc: Sarah McCarthy; Bridget Neylan
Subject: FW: Taxi Cameras

Hi,

I have completed some enquiries with a couple of electronic experts who work in the taxi camera space from time to time. They are NOT the two who test camera systems for us. I was after some information about which camera systems they see failing the most, but the information I got back was much more than that.

1. An ATO in Akld - **Section 9(2)(b)** - have imported their own camera system and simply labelled it with the brand and model name of an approved system and installed it in all their vehicles, but it is not an approved system and apparently bears no similarity with the real approved system. Bear in mind that no photos were taken of any of the systems approved prior to testing so it is difficult to ascertain which is legitimate and which is not.
2. The **Section 9(2)(b)(ii)** camera system, which was a popular system some parts of the country, has serious issues with footage not being able to be recovered at all. The operators and the electronic experts are unable to confirm if the systems are not recording at all or just won't allow access. These systems are now 3 years old and no longer under any warranty.
3. The **Section 9(2)** system - is having serious problems in that there have been numerous instances where the system is unable to record new footage over the old, as it is required to do. On viewing footage old footage recorded some time previously is being found. There is also common problems with the system powering off after 2-3 seconds and not the required 30 minutes. I am aware that the supplier would alter the powering off time from 1 min out to 10 minutes to suit operators trying to get longer battery life from cheaper car batteries, but the 2-3 seconds things has not come to light before. Qazi is having a new camera system tested at the moment, and has had a number of issues to overcome before it would be acceptable. This system may be certified in the near future and then approved.
4. One of the earlier camera systems - marketed as a **Section 9(2)(b)(ii)** - was apparently approved at the very start with some sales, but after the supplier disappeared there has been no sales or support. Sometime later another supplier - **Section 9(2)(b)(ii)** imported this same system under another name and got it approved, without any testing, and sold it in reasonable numbers. This is now the **Section 9(2)** system. It may be worth testing as there have been suggestions that there were issues at the start that were not able to be addressed as there was no supplier.
5. Another camera system - the **Section 9(2)(b)** - imported by the same supplier as the above system, was another system that was already approved, as the **Section 9(2)(b)(ii)**. At the end of last year another supplier imported this same camera system but unfortunately for him this was the first one that we tested prior to any approval. It failed in a number of areas, and the cost of modifications to achieve certification was too prohibitive so the supplier withdrew. This supplier was furious with us at the time as he knew that this exact system had already been approved twice, under different names, without any testing!

6. Therefore is it not surprising that the [Section 9(2)(b)(ii)] referred to above is also having a few problems in Alert Taxi's vehicles. I have just been informed that [Section 9(2)(b)(ii)] in China at this moment trying to buy the Sigtec model. I have emailed him advising him that it will be tested in the near future and if it fails that test it may be revoked. I have suggested that he seek more information before agreeing to a large purchase.

7. The Autoview AVTS8, used by Co-Op Taxis and several other larger ATO's is at this stage working well with no issues. This same camera system was imported by another supplier at the end of last year and was the second one tested for certification. Again the new supplier was angry with us as he had to pay for testing and make some minor upgrades to the system before achieving certification. This is now the Hi-Tech Taxi Cameras VJT100. I mention this one to show how easy it is for someone other than the initial supplier to 'poach' an already approved system and just market it under another name. I have been asked by those involved in supplying camera systems and by the taxi industry itself, to have suppliers approved also so as to avoid some of these issues.

Mark O'Donnell / Manager
(Acting in) Technical Support - OL/DL/DT Team - Delivery - Access and Use

[Section 9(2)(a)]

[Section 9(2)(b)(i)] / w nzta.govt.nz

Palmerston North Office / Level 3 IRD Building
Ashley Street, Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand



with the media because we tested the thing 3 weeks ago and did nothing about it for x weeks before taking action. This needs to be the approach with all those we test.

Just some things that have sprung to mind. I want one of each of the 5 or so systems that we have identified so that I can get it tested. If it passes then it will be certified and this will help sales! If not we need to revoke and advise the industry immediately. At this stage the approach is to issue a Notice of Intent to Revoke with a reasonable period allowed to replace those systems, rather than go down the exemption path. But I will get a legal opinion first.

Maybe we repeat our 2013 survey but try for a bit more accuracy from the Atos, so we get an idea on just how big this problem is. If you are able to identify what ATO has what camera system I would be very grateful. Talk to you tomorrow cheers

Mike

Sent from my HTC

----- Reply message -----

From: "Eileen Kerry" <Eileen.Kerry@nzta.govt.nz>
To: "Michael Collie" <Michael.Collie@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: Taxi Cameras
Date: Mon, Jun 9, 2014 17:09

----- Reply message -----

From: "Eileen Kerry" <Eileen.Kerry@nzta.govt.nz>
To: "Michael Collie" <Michael.Collie@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: Taxi Cameras
Date: Mon, Jun 9, 2014 15:47

Hi Mike

Please see below that came to me today from Mark, he is trying to get hold of a camera, power box and DVR of the systems in 1, 2, 3 and 4 below. If you are able to ask the technician tomorrow if they have any of these available that would be good, it may be that they have removed some?

Also, could you please look at the spreadsheets the ATOs sent in relation to their cameras and find out if any of these models are listed?

We will need to have a focus on Gold line at some stage and see what they have in their cars.

Cheers and thanks, Eileen

Eileen Kerry : Manager Transport Officers Safety & Operations

(09) 373 6100

Section 9(2)(a)

Email eileen.kerry@nzta.govt.nz

NZ Transport Agency HSBC House / 1 Queen St / Auckland / Private Bag 106602 / Auckland 1143



3. If we decide to do an exercise to 'test' cameras, is there any funding available should we wish to use a qualified technician to test some for us? Yes

We were planning to check if all the FAKE Hikvisions we were told had been replaced have been but that is a fairly superficial touch, e.g. looking at the unit and the lights. It would appear that there are still a number of these out there. How we identify them I am not sure but it could be as simple as asking the ATO to identify what systems they have. The importers are very concerned when we use the Hikvision name so I refer to them as the Fake camera systems.

4. If we find faults with approved systems, what is our position? e.g. who would pay for replacements? At this stage it is the opinion that the operator/ATO wears the cost. No thought to any compensation and we should not mention it. This is a "mid-life to end-life review of taxi security cameras" and not a test to identify systems that should not have been approved in the first place.

Cheers, Eileen

Eileen Kerry / Manager Transport Officers - Safety & Operations

Access & Use

Section 9(2)(a)

Email eileen.kerry@nzta.govt.nz

NZ Transport Agency HSBC House / 1 Queen St / Auckland / Private Bag 106602 / Auckland 1143



Other people
make mistakes
Slow down

From: Michael Collie
Sent: Monday, 9 June 2014 6:01 p.m.
To: Eileen Kerry
Subject: Re: Taxi Cameras

Hi Eileen the first things that spring to mind are:

- 1 how reliable are Marks informants. Do they have alter motives – Reliable and with no obvious ulterior motives.
- 2 Batterylink is one of our two current approved certifiers. What two certifiers? There is no such thing? The two businesses in Hamilton who carry out testing for us are not Batterylink. I am aware that a couple of installers were advertising themselves as "Certified Installers" and there is no such thing! I pulled one of them up over it.

3 we need to keep a lid on this for as long as possible until we get some facts/proof or all hell will break loose with the ATOs and media etc. Actually we need to get the failed Taxi Guard system revoked as soon as possible so that others don't buy one second hand and then spit the dummy

I go back to what I have previously suggested the original supplier should be able to advise if they have any original systems available.

I believe in many cases they will no longer be available and have probably been updated partially or completely.

Again we may never know if the overseas supplier is colluding with them and simply putting a label on to say it was the same system??

Maybe that's the other avenue of inquiry (the overseas supplier)

As stated I have heard anecdotally that most of the stocks of cameras and dvr's are no longer available

Keith McGuire
Transport Officer
Section 9(2)(a)
[REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email

NZ Transport Agency
24 Bridge Street
Deloitte House
P O Box 973
Hamilton 3240
New Zealand
T 64 7 958 7220
F 64 7 957 1437
www.nzta.govt.nz

From: Mark O'Donnell
Sent: Wednesday, 11 June 2014 4:42 p.m.
To: Eileen Kerry; Michael Collie; Maurice Smith; Dermot Harris; Keith McGuire; Rob Barton; Sean Cronin
Subject: RE: Taxi Cameras

See below in red

From: Eileen Kerry
Sent: Tuesday, 10 June 2014 9:05 a.m.
To: Mark O'Donnell
Cc: Michael Collie
Subject: FW: Taxi Cameras

Hi Mark

I have been talking to Mike about this and he has raised some valid points, see below. In order to progress this further can you let me know:

1. Are you able to comment on Mike's query below at 1? See below
2. Is there an appetite for us to write to all the ATOs, as we did with Hikvision and ask them what systems they have installed, the last test date and results? Yes!

From: Mark O'Donnell
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2014 2:28 p.m.
To: Keith McGuire
Subject: RE: Taxi Cameras

Thanks Keith

Mark O'Donnell / Manager
(Acting in) Technical Support OL DL/DT Team Delivery Access and Use
Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
E [Section 9(2)(a)] [w nzta.govt.nz](http://nzta.govt.nz)
Palmerston North Office / Level 3 IRD Building
Ashley Street, Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand



From: Keith McGuire
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2014 1:17 p.m.
To: Mark O'Donnell
Subject: RE: Taxi Cameras

Hi Mark

I am out at Fieldays tomorrow , so won't be able to add much value.

As far as all of the dialogue below

It looks to me like you have the list of systems to check as per the ones identified below as having issues.

If they are all as bad as we are led to believe then we look at the next few....

All of the ATO's should have accurate records of what camera systems are installed in their vehicles
It should be just a matter of matching that information with what is in a vehicle to confirm if it is likely an original system

It should all line up

The car rego , fleet number ,camera system , DVR and possibly camera serial numbers were supposed to be recorded way back at the start in fact they should have also recorded the "NZTA" label number supplied in the original approval process.

If the records is not available then the supplier and or the installer may have those records.
At the end of the day it is nothing more than an "audit check"

Supposing we can identify original installs then I guess it is those systems we should be checking and having removed from the cars.

We could also contact the supplier we may not have a record or photos of the systems but the manuals will often have photos in the body of the manual including front , side , rear top and bottom views along with an internal photo of the board.

Any supplier leary of providing the information may also be one to flag

From: Iain Rossiter
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2014 3:44 p.m.
To: Mark O'Donnell
Subject: FW: Taxi Cameras

Hi Mark

I've held my silence for now having a bit of think on this and your earlier email looking for 4-5 Camera Systems to bench test.

I'm thinking if we don't know the system is broke then we shouldn't be looking to fix it. And apart from few examples (taxi guard and Hik Vision) we haven't had ATO's wailing at us for all the camera systems not working.

I understand with the Taxi Guard that we approved the system originally when the documents provided indicated it did not meet the (then) criteria. It's probably a camera system that's not that common with only (I hear) 200-500 in circulation. But it could be an expensive exercise if someone is looking for compensation.

If we pick of Lyntek in this next round and find they were approved when they never should have been approved in the first place. That could be 1000+ taxis that need to change their camera system and cost in dollars and reputation to NZTA.

I wonder if we're not better off budgeting to bench test 1 or 2 systems each year and only pick them off if the chatter in the Industry gets loud. Otherwise we continue to work with the companies to ensure they are testing their camera systems on a regular basis.

Cheers

Iain

From: Keith McGuire
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2014 2:45 p.m.
To: Iain Rossiter
Subject: FW: Taxi Cameras

Have you seen this stuff or aware of it?

Keith McGuire
Transport Officer
Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

Please consider the environment before printing this email

NZ Transport Agency
24 Bridge Street
Deloitte House
P O Box 973
Hamilton 3240
New Zealand
T 64 7 958 7220
F 64 7 957 1437
www.nzta.govt.nz

Jackie Smith

From: Sam Russell
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 7:27 PM
To: Sam Russell
Subject: FW: Taxi Cameras

Sam Russell / Customer Advisor - Ministerials

Operations - Customer Services

E sam.russell@nzta.govt.nz / W nzta.govt.nz

Palmerston North Office

Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

From: Iain Rossiter
Sent: Friday, 13 June 2014 9:51 AM
To: Mark O'Donnell <Mark.O'Donnell@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Taxi Cameras

Yeah – sorry to hear about Section 9(2)

From: Mark O'Donnell
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2014 4:40 p.m.
To: Iain Rossiter
Subject: RE: Taxi Cameras

I did wonder where you were! I don't disagree with your suggestion, and am keen to revoke the Taxi Guard on its own, but in endeavouring to have that happen I have had to explain the whole situation to others. The issue has now got bigger, bigger than I anticipated.

The issues that have been raised recently include:

- The Taxi Fed have revealed that the Lintec is having serious problems in a number of fleets.
- We have now confirmed that the first one tested by Carl that failed is merely a copy of a model that is already out there under 2 other names. We can hardly ignore this fact and will have to test them both. Qazi is about to import this same system under yet another name, so I have warned him that it is likely to be tested in the near future and if it fails he will not be able to on-sell it.
- Qazi's existing system is also having serious issues with recordings.
- Etc

So now that we know these things we are fairly limited in our ability to ignore them. My view anyway. But once the whole picture is painted there may be a reluctance to proceed. The view is that because we have a disclaimer on our website about camera systems that we should be fairly well protected. Time will tell. But to counter that is the risk of reputation if a taxi driver is attacked and the camera records nothing for various reasons and it comes out that we have sat back knowing the issues and have done nothing.

I have been bleating about these issues for several years and had actually passed the parcel to Delivery as I was instructed to. But I then find myself seconded to the very role that manages this damn thing!!

BTW – did you hear about Section 9(2)? He is in Whangarei Hospital with the cancer back and it is in his liver and brain. ~~Section 9(2)~~ one of life's gentleman and deserved better than that in retirement!
()

Mark

Jackie Smith

From: Sam Russell
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 7:25 PM
To: Sam Russell
Subject: FW: concern from Dunedin

Sam Russell / Customer Advisor - Ministerials
Operations - Customer Services
E sam.russell@nzta.govt.nz / W nzta.govt.nz
Palmerston North Office
Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

From: Darrin Fisher
Sent: Wednesday, 16 July 2014 8:24 AM
To: Mark O'Donnell <Mark.O'Donnell@nzta.govt.nz>; Eileen Kerry <Eileen.Kerry@nzta.govt.nz>; Dermot Harris <Dermot.Harris@nzta.govt.nz>; Rob Barton <Robert.Barton@nzta.govt.nz>; Tony McNeill <Tony.McNeill@nzta.govt.nz>; Iain Rossiter <Iain.Rossiter@nzta.govt.nz>; Sam Harris <Sam.Harris@nzta.govt.nz>; Elizabeth Sidler <Elizabeth.Sidler@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: concern from Dunedin

It's not a rumour, I can make inquiries with Williams Electrical here in Napier as they fix them. I was made aware of the issue several weeks ago and passed the info to Mark

Darrin Fisher / Senior Transport Officer

Access and Use

DDI Section 9(2) / M Section 9(2)
E darrin.fisher@nzta.govt.nz / W nzta.govt.nz

Level 2, Dunvegan House, 215 Hastings Street,
PO Box 740, Napier 4140, New Zealand



TRANSPORT
AGENCY
nzta.govt.nz



From: Section 9(2)(a)

Sent: Tuesday, 15 July 2014 5:55 p.m.

To: Eileen Kerry; Dermot Harris; Rob Barton; Tony McNeill; Iain Rossiter; Sam Harris; Elizabeth Sidler

Cc: Darrin Fisher

Subject: Re: concern from Dunedin

Rumours! There have been a number of concerns raised in recent times about the Lintec camera system with several ATO's affected. The drop in voltage that Eric mentions is the main concern. With the systems now well outside any warranty who pays for a widespread problem is an added concern.

I have suggested to Michael C that if these issues are as widespread as reported then we may have to test one of them and respond accordingly after testing. But nothing further has happened. I will contact [s9(2)(a)] tomorrow and have a chat. I am not sure how this got out into the industry, but it could be that our testing of another system with problems, the Taxiguard, has allowed someone to form a conclusion.

----- Original message -----

From: Eileen Kerry
Date: 15/07/2014 16:47 (GMT+12:00)
To: Dermot Harris ,Rob Barton ,Tony McNeill ,Iain Rossiter ,Mark O'Donnell
Subject: RE: concern from Dunedin

Nil from mc

Eileen Kerry / Manager Transport Officers - Safety & Operations
Access & Use

DDI Section [REDACTED] / M Section [REDACTED]

Email eileen.kerry@nzta.govt.nz

NZ Transport Agency HSBC House / 1 Queen St / Auckland / Private Bag 106602 / Auckland 1143



From: Dermot Harris
Sent: Tuesday, 15 July 2014 4:42 p.m.
To: Rob Barton; Tony McNeill; Eileen Kerry; Iain Rossiter; Mark O'Donnell
Subject: RE: concern from Dunedin

No first I have heard suggest Mark O'Donnell would be the best informed on this matter.

Dermot Harris / Manager Transport Officers

Access and Use

DDI [Section 9(2) / M [Section 9(2)(a)]
()

E dermot.harris@nzta.govt.nz / w nzta.govt.nz

Dunedin Office / Level 2, AA Centre
450 Moray Place, Dunedin 9058, New Zealand



From: Rob Barton

Sent: Tuesday, 15 July 2014 4:27 p.m.

To: Dermot Harris; Tony McNeill; Eileen Kerr; Iain Rossiter

Subject: FW: concern from Dunedin

Hi,

Have any of you heard anything, as below?

Could be a vicious rumour.

Rob

From: John Taiaroa

Sent: Tuesday, 15 July 2014 2:20 p.m.

To: Rob Barton

Cc: Blaise Hotop; Deo Naidu

Subject: FW: concern from Dunedin

Just spoken with [§9(2)] to say that I hadn't heard anything about this - do you know anything Rob, boys??

JT

John Taiaroa / Transport Officer

Access & Use - Central

From: Section 9(2)(a) [§9(2)]
Sent: Tuesday, 15 July 2014 1:55 p.m.
To: Blaise Hotop, John Taiaroa
Subject: FW: concern from Dunedin

Hi Blaise/John,

As below, any idea if this is just some rumour the drivers are passing around? I would imagine I'd be told officially by NZTA the reasons but if it's true I better stop all our orders and manufacturing of the voltage regulator that we're adding on in the next 6 month check to combat the voltage drop issues.

Any insight would be good! Thanks!

Section
n 9(2)

From: Section 9(2)(a) [§9(2)]
Sent: Tuesday, 15 July 2014 1:35 p.m.
To: Section 9(2)(a) [§9(2)]
Subject: concern from dunedin

Hi Sect
ion

I just received a call from one of our directors who is attending a Fed meeting in wellington today.

He advises that he has been told Lintec could be losing their approval status from NZTA for the camera. Do you know anything about this?

Kind Regards

Section 9(2)(a)

Section
9(2)(a)

Dunedin Taxis (1965) Ltd

Phone Section 9(2)(a)

Email: Section 9(2)(a)

Please note: email contact is Mon-Fri 8am to 4pm.



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



From: Mark O'Donnell
Sent: Friday, 18 July 2014 2:46 p.m.
To: Darrin Fisher; Sam Harris; Elizabeth Sidler; Keith McGuire; Eileen Kerry; Dermot Harris; Tony McNeill; Maurice Smith; Rob Barton; Sean Cronin; Iain Rossiter
Cc: Mark Kinvig
Subject: Lintek Taxi camera Systems

Hi,

I have just got off the phone from [Section 9(2)(b)] from Lintek, after calling him to discuss the "rumours" about his Lintek TaxiTrek T1 camera system about to be revoked by NZTA after recent issues.

He was keen to be upfront and advised me that the main issue with his camera systems around the country is that many of the vehicles they were installed in have not had new car batteries fitted in 3 years, and these batteries are subsequently commonly dropping below producing 10 volts at start-up and at times when there is a heavy drain. The cameras require a constant 10+ volts and so dropping below that makes the camera system believe that it is being uninstalled or powered down so it closes down. Lintek have supplied and installed a large number of voltage regulators, free on vehicles with camera systems still under warranty, or at a low cost for others. The cost of the regulator is \$39.00 plus a fitting cost, with many being fitted by auto electricians in the centres where the ATO's are based.

The voltage regulator ensures that the camera systems receives a constant 10+ volts, with no further issues being reported from any vehicles with them installed. Taxi operators are reluctant to replace car batteries until they really have to, and this has caused the issue.

[Section 9(2)(b)] assures me that the camera systems themselves are still working fine, with few problems. He believes that if we tested any of his camera systems they would comply with the standards.

He does not know where the rumour started, but he is pleased to hear that we are not about to revoke his camera systems.

Thanks to Darrin for bringing this to my attention.

Mark O'Donnell / Manager

(Acting in Technical Support / OI, DL/DI Team / Delivery / Access and Use)

DDI [Section 9(2)(b)] / M [Section 9(2)(a)]

E [Section 9(2)(a)]@nzta.govt.nz

Palmerston North Office / Level 3 IRD Building
Ashley Street, Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

Jackie Smith

From: Sam Russell
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 7:24 PM
To: Sam Russell
Subject: FW: Lintek Taxi camera Systems

Sam Russell / Customer Advisor - Ministerials
Operations Customer Services
E sam.russell@nzta.govt.nz / W nzta.govt.nz
Palmerston North Office
Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

From: Mark O'Donnell
Sent: Friday, 18 July 2014 3:22 PM
To: Eileen Kerry <Eileen.Kerry@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Lintek Taxi camera Systems

No, the adjudicators will do that as part of the Notice of intent process. The list of ATO's and what gear they have will make that a much easier task. I just need Midlands to do their bit on that. Thanks

Mark O'Donnell / Manager
Acting in Technical Support - CL DL DT Team - Delivery - Access and Us
DDI [Section 9\(2\) / M](tel:Section 9(2) / M) [Section 9\(2\) / W](tel:Section 9(2) / W)
E [Section 9\(2\)\(a\) / W](mailto:Section 9(2)(a) / W) nzta.govt.nz
Palmerston North Office / Level 3 IRD Building
Ashley Street, Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand



From: Eileen Kerry
Sent: Friday, 18 July 2014 2:48 p.m.
To: Mark O'Donnell
Subject: RE: Lintek Taxi camera Systems

Thank you, do we need to let the ATOs know?

Cheers, Eileen

Eileen Kerry / Manager Transport Officers - Safety & Operations
Access & Use
DDI [Section 9\(2\) / M](tel:Section 9(2) / M) [Section 9\(2\) / W](tel:Section 9(2) / W)
Email eileen.kerry@nzta.govt.nz

Jackie Smith

From: Sam Russell
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 7:23 PM
To: Sam Russell
Subject: FW: Lintek Taxi camera Systems

Sam Russell / Customer Advisor - Ministerials
Operations - Customer Services
E sam.russell@nzta.govt.nz / W nzta.govt.nz
Palmerston North Office
Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

From: Rob Barton
Sent: Tuesday, 22 July 2014 8:37 AM
To: Blaise Hotop <Blaise.Hotop@nzta.govt.nz>; Deo Naidu <Deo.Naidu@nzta.govt.nz>; John Taiaroa <John.Taiaroa@nzta.govt.nz>; Rob McEwen <Rob.McEwen@nzta.govt.nz>; Neil McAlpine <Neil.McAlpine@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Lintek Taxi camera Systems

Hi team,

FYI. There have been rumours about lintek cameras. Read below. Obviously there have been issues, but it appears that those issues are being rectified.
The fear for Eric was that his cameras would no longer be approved. This seems to have no foundation. Good news for us as most of our operators use this brand/system.

Rob

From: Mark O'Donnell
Sent: Friday, 18 July 2014 2:46 p.m.
To: Darrin Fisher; Sam Harris; Elizabeth Sidler; Keith McGuire; Eileen Kerry; Dermot Harris; Tony McNeill; Maurice Smith; Rob Barton; Sean Cronin; Iain Rossiter
Cc: Mark Kinvig
Subject: Lintek Taxi camera Systems

Hi,

I have just got off the phone from ~~Section~~ from Lintek, after calling him to discuss the "rumours" about his Lintek TaxiTrek T1 camera system about to be revoked by NZTA after recent issues.

He was keen to be upfront and advised me that the main issue with his camera systems around the country is that many of the vehicles they were installed in have not had new car batteries fitted in 3 years, and these batteries are subsequently commonly dropping below producing 10 volts at start-up and at times when there is a heavy drain. The cameras require a constant 10+ volts and so dropping below that makes the camera system believe that it is being uninstalled or powered down so it closes down. Lintek have supplied and installed a large number of voltage regulators, free on vehicles with camera systems still under warranty, or at a low cost for others. The cost of the regulator is \$39.00 plus a fitting cost, with many being fitted by auto electricians in the centres where the ATO's are based.

The voltage regulator ensures that the camera systems receives a constant 10+ volts, with no further issues being reported from any vehicles with them installed. Taxi operators are reluctant to replace car batteries until they really have to, and this has caused the issue.

Secti ssures me that the camera systems themselves are still working fine, with few problems. He believes that if we tested any of his camera systems they would comply with the standards.

He does not know where the rumour started, but he is pleased to hear that we are not about to revoke his camera systems.

Thanks to Darrin for bringing this to my attention.

Mark O'Donnell / Manager

(Acting in) Technical Support OI:DI DT Team Delivery Access and Use

DDI Section 9(2) / M Section 9(2)

E Section 9(2)(a) www.nzta.govt.nz

Palmerston North Office / Level 3 IRD Building
Ashley Street, Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand



Jackie Smith

From: Sam Russell
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 6:39 PM
To: Sam Russell
Subject: FW: Lintek camera footage s9(2)(a) [REDACTED] requested re complaint Friday 14th Oct 2016 1500-1515hrs

Sam Russell / Customer Advisor – Ministerials Operations – Customer Services E sam.russell@nzta.govt.nz / W nzta.govt.nz Palmerston North Office Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

-----Original Message-----

From: s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 28 October 2016 3:58 PM
To: Peter Taylor <Peter.Taylor@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: Lintek camera footage s9(2)(a) [REDACTED] equested re complaint Friday 14th Oct 2016 1500-1515hrs

Hi Peter

No problem.

Here is a dropbox link for a zipped copy of the viewer if you need it.
Just unzip and run viewer directly. Does not need to be "installed".

s9(2)(a)
[REDACTED]

Logon and password are s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

Best Regards

s9(2)(a)
[REDACTED]

Alcom Communication Services Ltd
295 Te Ngae Road
ROTORUA

Ph (07)345 8655

On 28/10/2016 3:08 p.m., Peter Taylor wrote:

> Hi Section

> s9(2)(a)

> Thank you for the email.

> We are have difficulty viewing the footage but a colleague will attempt to view it using different software this weekend.

>

> In the interim, can you please ensure you save the footage in case there is a need for me to view it at your offices'.

>

> Thanks again.

>
> Kind regards
>
>
> Peter
> Peter Taylor / Commercial Transport Officer Access and Use, Waikato /
> Bay of Plenty DDI [Section 9(2)(a)] M [Section 9(2)(e)]
> peter.taylor@nzta.govt.nz / w nzta.govt.nz Hamilton Office / Level 1,
> Deloitte Building
> 24 Anzac Parade, PO Box 973, Hamilton 3240, New Zealand
>
> _____

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: [Section 9(2)(a)]
> Sent: Friday, 28 October 2016 1:33 p.m.
> To: Peter Taylor
> Subject: Lintek camera footage [s9(2)(a)] requested re
> complaint Friday 14th Oct 2016 1500-1515hrs
>
> Peter
>
> As requested by [Section 9(2)(a)] of Rotorua Taxis I have provided a dropbox link to footage recovered from the Lintek
taxi camera that [Section 9(2)(a)] believes relates to the complaint you have received.
>
> Unfortunately, as is often the case with these Lintek cameras, the date and time of the recorder has reset to a
default at some stage prior to the reported incident so the date and time stamps do not relate to the time and date
requested. This occurs in our experience, when voltage levels in the vehicle drop under a starting load.
>
> Subsequently, I have downloaded all footage on the hard-drive and searched for any situation in which the driver
was alone in the vehicle with a young woman. There were only three occasions this occurred. Two were young maori
women and one was caucasian.
>
> On [Section 9(2)(a)] request I have downloaded the footage relating to the young caucasian woman for you to download and
view.
>
> <http://scanmail.trustwave.com/?c=2838&d=3L652MVPYiyLcZIJ16I5J745jepayR&hUvkX48TN5CA&u=https%3a%2f%2fwww%2edropbox%2ecom%2fs%2f57526u0cg0tavsf%2fCH1-PMS102CR-01012000-182717%2eps%3fdI%3d0>
>
> Best Regards
>
> [Section 9(2)(a)]

> Alcom Communication Services Ltd
> 295 Te Ngae Road
> ROTORUA
>
> Ph (07)345 8655
>
> Find the latest transport news, information, and advice on our website:

> http://scanmail.trustwave.com/?c=2838&d=3L6S2MVPYiyLcZIJ16l5J745jepayR
> hUvhOs9mAtUg&u=http%3a%2f%2fwww%2enzta%2egovt%2enz
>
> #####
> This email is only intended to be read by the named recipient. It may
> contain information which is confidential, proprietary or the subject
> of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must
> delete this email and may not use any information contained in it.
> Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email.
> #####
>
>
> -----
> No virus found in this message.
> Checked by AVG -
> http://scanmail.trustwave.com/?c=2838&d=3L6S2MVPYiyLcZIJ16l5J745jepayR
> hUvhH49TMrCQ&u=http%3a%2f%2fwww%2eavg%2ecom
> Version: 2015.0.6173 / Virus Database: 4664/13291 - Release Date:
> 10/27/16

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Jackie Smith

From: Sam Russell
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 6:33 PM
To: Sam Russell
Subject: FW: EW921011070478 for HQH200

Sam Russell / Customer Advisor - Ministerials
Operations - Customer Services
E sam.russell@nzta.govt.nz / W nzta.govt.nz
Palmerston North Office
Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

From: Margaret Oram
Sent: Wednesday, 26 July 2017 2:32 PM
To: [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)
Subject: RE: EW921011070478 for [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)

I have been advised that the camera is not required and you can go ahead and have it serviced.

Thank you.

Regards,

Maggie Oram / Commercial Transport Officer
Access & Use- Central
DDI [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#) / M [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)
E margaret.oram@nzta.govt.nz

From: [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)
Sent: Wednesday, 26 July 2017 2:16 PM
To: Margaret Oram <Margaret.Oram@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: EW921011070478 for [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)

Thank you.

From: Margaret Oram [mailto:Margaret.Oram@nzta.govt.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 26 July 2017 2:16 p.m.
To: [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)
Subject: RE: EW921011070478 for [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)

Hi [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)

Sorry about this. I will resend my emails (urgent).

Maggie Oram / Commercial Transport Officer
Access & Use- Central
DDI [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#) / M [Section 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)
E margaret.oram@nzta.govt.nz

From: Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 26 July 2017 2:12 PM
To: Margaret Oram <Margaret.Oram@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: EW921011070478 for Section 9(2)(a)

Hi Maggie,

Do we have an update regarding the camera?

We have limited spares so I would like to get this repaired as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
New Zealand Taxi Communications
Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]



This email and any attachments transmitted with it are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient or person responsible for delivering the email to the intended recipient, you are prohibited from disclosing, copying or using the information contained in it. If you have received this email in error, please inform us by email reply and delete the message and attached documents. We use virus scanning software but exclude all liability for viruses or similar in any attachments.

From: Margaret Oram [mailto:Margaret.Oram@nzta.govt.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 13 July 2017 3:18 p.m.
To: Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: EW921011070478 for Section 9(2)(a)

Hello again,

The Police Officer that responded to the incident is on leave until mid-next week apparently, so can you hold off doing anything until I am able to confirm..

Many thanks,

Maggie Oram / Commercial Transport Officer
Access & Use - Central
[REDACTED] Section 9(2)(a) / M Section 9(2)(a)
margaret.oram@nzta.govt.nz

From: Margaret Oram
Sent: Thursday, 13 July 2017 2:56 PM
To: Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: EW921011070478 for Section 9(2)(a)

Great thanks,

I will see if I can get an answer for you.

Maggie Oram / Commercial Transport Officer
Access & Use- Central

DDI Section [REDACTED] / M Section 9(2)
E margaret.oram@nzta.govt.nz

From: Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 13 July 2017 2:50 PM
To: Margaret Oram <Margaret.Oram@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: EW921011070478 for Section [REDACTED]
9(2)(a)

Oops sorry, yes you are correct.

From: Margaret Oram [mailto:Margaret.Oram@nzta.govt.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 13 July 2017 2:48 p.m.
To: Section 9(2) [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: EW921011070478 for Section [REDACTED]
9(2)(a)

Section [REDACTED]
Hello 9(2)(a)

Although I'm 99% sure this is referring to the footage you were trying to get from the incident dated [REDACTED] Section 9(2)(a). I thought I would just get it confirmed before I check with the Police to determine if they need the unit. I would hate to advise you the Police don't require it, then find out the Police do for a separate incident.

Maggie Oram / Commercial Transport Officer
Access & Use- Central

DDI Section [REDACTED] / M Section 9(2)
E margaret.oram@nzta.govt.nz

From: Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 13 July 2017 8:49 AM
To: Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Cc: Margaret Oram <Margaret.Oram@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: EW921011070478 for Section [REDACTED]
9(2)(a)

Good morning Section [REDACTED]
9(2)(a)

It would be advisable to hold that unit for a while just in case the police require it.

Thank you

From: Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 12 July 2017 5:33 p.m.
To: Section 9(2) [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: EW921011070478 for Section [REDACTED]
9(2)(a)

Hi Section [REDACTED]
9(2)(a)

Please see below. How would you like to proceed.

Section 9(2)(a)

Manawatu Communications Limited
T/A Adamson & Holland

T Section 9(2)(a)
F
M
E

889 Tremaine Avenue, P O Box 10060
Palmerston North 4441



From: Section 9(2)(a)

Sent: Wednesday, 12 July 2017 4:33 p.m.

To: Section 9(2)(a)

Subject: EW921011070478 for Section 9(2)(a)

Hi Section 9(2)(a)

We just received one camera above for footage download for police report, unfortunately we couldn't download the footage due to HDD failure, pls let us know if they want to repair or replaced with T2?

Best Regards

Section 9(2)(a)

MOB: Section 9(2)(a)

Email:

Section 9(2)(a)

www.Lintek.co.nz

Find the latest transport news, information, and advice on our website:

www.nzta.govt.nz

This email is only intended to be read by the named recipient. It may contain information which is confidential, proprietary or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must delete this email and may not use any information contained in it. Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email.

Find the latest transport news, information, and advice on our website:
www.nzta.govt.nz

This email is only intended to be read by the named recipient. It may contain information which is confidential, proprietary or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must delete this email and may not use any information contained in it. Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email.